

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Examiner Tran is thanked for carefully examining this application and for indicating that Claims 5-8 are allowable.

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1, 5, 9, 15 and 16 being the only independent claims. Claims 5-8 are allowed, thereby leaving Claims 1-4 and 9-16 as the only claims currently at issue.

Rejections of Claims 1, 15 and 16

Claims 1, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,947 to *Mikuni* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,119 to *Suzuki et al.*

Claims 1, 15 and 16 include a feature generally directed to saving received image data. It appears that the Examiner has not fully appreciated that Claims 1, 15 and 16 define that the image data that is saved is the received image data and that the received image data is saved in its original form. Therefore, Claims 1, 15 and 16 have been amended to more explicitly define this feature of the present invention. Claims 1, 15 and 16 now define, among other features, a receiving unit that receives image data in an original form, a printing unit that prints out an image based on the received image data, and a saving unit that saves the received image data in the original form in a recording medium.

Another feature of the present invention is generally directed to instructing a save operation before it is begun. Specifically: Claim 1 defines a control unit that

begins a printing operation by the printing unit and a data save operation by the saving unit consecutively in case that the both operations are instructed before they are begun; Claim 15 defines instructing a data save operation and saving the received original image data in original form in a recording medium; and Claim 16 defines a control unit that sets a parameter for a printing operation and for a data save operation before they are begun by the printing unit and the saving unit.

Mikuni discloses an image processing system utilized with a navigation system. Image information from a digital camera 1 and position information from a CD-ROM player 34 are synthesized together. The synthesized image data is then delivered to a RAM 27 and subsequently to a floppy disk in a drive 32.

The Official Action recognizes that *Mikuni* does not disclose the claimed feature generally directed to the save operation being instructed before the save operation is begun, and sets forth that *Suzuki et al.* remedies this deficiency.

Suzuki et al. discloses a file system. During operation, document data is obtained by a reading unit 26. The recording unit 27 prints the document data. During the printing operation, the data is automatically archived by a server 12 without a specific operation for archiving. See column 14, lines 1-5.

Claims 1, 15 and 16 should be allowable at least because *Mikuni* does not disclose saving the received image data in the original form as defined in Claims 1, 15 and 16, but rather saving synthesized image data. The synthesized image data is made up of the image data produced by the digital camera 1 combined with position data produced by the CD-ROM player 34 and is not received image data in original form. Therefore, *Mikuni* does not disclose a receiving unit that receives image data

in an original form and a saving unit that saves the received image data in the original form in a recording medium as defined in Claims 1, 15 and 16.

Even if *Mikuni* did disclose the above noted feature, *Suzuki et al.* does not disclose a save operation being instructed before the save operation is begun together with the other features that are generally defined in Claims 1, 15 and 16. The Official Action points toward column 14, lines 1-5 of *Suzuki et al.* for a disclosure of this feature, however, it seems that this section of *Suzuki et al.* actually discloses the opposite of what was proposed in the Official Action, i.e., that "the document data...is automatically archived by the server 12 ... without a specific operation for the back-up document data (archiving)." Therefore, it is clear that the save operation in *Suzuki et al.* is not instructed before beginning, but rather is done automatically without a specific instruction. Therefore, *Suzuki et al.* does not disclose a save operation being instructed before the save operation is begun together with the other features of the present invention as generally defined in Claims 1, 15 and 16.

For at least the reasons stated above, *Mikuni* in view of *Suzuki et al.* does not disclose the invention defined in Claims 1, 15 and 16.

Rejection of Claim 9

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mikuni* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,158 B1 to *Goldberg*.

Claim 9 has been amended in a similar manner as Claims 1, 15 and 16 to more explicitly define that image data received is saved in original form. Thus, Claim 9 now defines an image printer system that includes, among other features, a receiving unit that receives image data in an original form, a correcting unit that

corrects the received image data, a printing unit that prints an image based on the corrected image data, and a saving unit that saves the received image data in the original form in a recording medium.

As noted earlier, *Mikuni* does not disclose a receiving unit that receives image data in an original form and a saving unit that saves the received image data in the original form in a recording medium. Also, as the Official Action correctly notes, *Mikuni* fails to disclose a correction unit that corrects the received image data. The Official Action relies on *Goldberg* to satisfy this deficiency. However, even if *Goldberg* discloses the feature for which it is relied upon by the Examiner, it still does not overcome *Mikuni*'s failure to disclose a saving unit that saves the received image data in original form together with the other features defined in Claim 9.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons stated above, independent Claims 1, 9, 15 and 16 are allowable. Also, dependent Claims 2-4 and 10-14 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence upon independent Claims 1 and 9.

Applicants have set forth positions distinguishing over the cited prior art references. With regard to the Examiner's description of the prior art references, Applicants reserve the right to further challenge the accuracy of such descriptions at a later time, if necessary and proper.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: September 17, 2004

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620